

European Workshop
Perspectives of Web 2.0 for Citizenship Education in Europe

7 - 9 April 2011
Brno, Czech Republic

Report

Workshop II Web 2.0 as Innovative Toolbox?

by Nathalie Doodkorte

The House for Democracy and the Rule of Law, the Netherlands

Input:

Jöran Muuß-Merholz, J&K - Jöran und Konsorten, Agency for Education (Germany)

Project Presentations:

www.gudrasgalvas.lv

presented by Linda Jakobson, Centre for Public Policy PROVIDUS (Latvia)

WEB 0: Bringing online communication tools to the street

presented by Julius Narkunas, Lamikis.lt (Lithuania)

Network Democracy

presented by Mieke van Heeswijk, Network Democracy (the Netherlands)

Moderation:

Stefan Huber, University of Salzburg (Austria)

During the workshop the group will formulate answers to the three guiding questions:

1. Does Web 2.0 offer an innovative and interesting toolbox for citizenship education?
2. Does the changing culture of participation and activation through the net cause new requirements regarding the target groups of citizenship education?
3. What are the most important challenges/ requirements concerning citizenship education?

Input by Jöran Muuß-Merholz

The thought behind Web 2.0 is that everyone can contribute in society, by use of several tools. In his presentation Jöran presented a sketchy map of scenarios in which Web 2.0 can be used for citizenship education. Jöran is a translator, interface, connector and curator. Education and learning versus digital media and communication are his defining connection proposals.

Three proto-formats of face-to-face (f2f) events:

1. Conference
2. Talk/panel
3. Workshop

Conference:

Invitation → spread the word about your event by **Twitter or social networks** and promotion. Big online representation. Shared preparation. Besides promotion, social media can be used to start a conversation with the people who are interested in the subject of your work.

Conversation and broadcasting. → **livestream**. This might be started next year. In order to extend it to a worldwide public.

During the conference → communication by Twitter wall. Not only questions can be asked, but also the audience can get together to share ideas.

Documentation and sharing conference's results through different platforms such as **Slideshare, Flickr, Podcast or Youtube**.

Collaboration, organisation & coordination. Social bookmarks to collect different sources (also for the participants) and availability of other community platforms like **Mixxt** to prepare the sessions. **Wikis** and **Etherpads** for collaborated documents of sessions (16 persons at the same time writing in one document).
Blogs.

Talk/panel: Samewise, but on a smaller scale-fade out collaboration. Might be an institutional blog.

Workshop: Probably you won't have a livestream. Seminar walls (only for participants).

Collaboration → **doodle** for decision-making or a **dropbox** for sharing files.
New: creating. They have results and outcome. E.g. **mindmaps, dipity, animoto and tools from documentation & sharing**.
Blogs.

Geocaching connects history with the present, and questionnaires and forums for evaluation can be done.

Further explanation of: **Geocaching**: On a GPS device you download a description. On certain coordinates is cash. Düsseldorfer Landtag (parliament): you can follow four houses, which have been developed since 1945. You can get a code to pass to the next station.

Etherpad is a very simple text editor, and while you use it, everyone can write in it at the same time. Every author has a colour, and you can collaborate in the same document. Written record sessions can be used, or a creation of a demand list.

Animoto: you can put in photos and text and animoto makes a modern slide show or movie of it.

Discussion:

During the event #LogIn2010 there was a Twitter wall and the presenter standing on front of it. A failure in this case was that the stream was live, but it shouldn't be so visible during the session. Communication is valuable and depends on social adjustment.

Another example was implemented on an event where three Twitter walls were projected, and it was possible to pick up questions of people who weren't at the event. The best option is to place the Twitter wall on the side instead of in the front, so the speaker can see it and the audience can choose to look or not look at it. During collaborative written reports, it is important that someone is responsible (maintainer or moderator).

Summary:

Online tools implemented in a functional way, thinking ahead of the final setting. They need some careful planning. Don't forget about the emotional part. It works better when there is a consensus, because there will be a collaborative work and it is easier when there is broad agreement in the room. The main focus should be on the people in the room and not on the tools. Keyword in the discussion is mindfulness.

Project Presentation by Linda Jakobsone (Latvia)

GudrasGalvas.lv now available archived here: old.gudrasgalvas.lv. GudrasGalvas literally means smart heads.

The main purpose of the project was to increase direct communication between voters and politicians. This was achieved by providing a simple on-line platform where each candidate could register his/her profile, state their motivation of becoming a member of the parliament and answer questions from the public. This seemed particularly important in the absence of active campaign culture (elections campaigns in Latvia have traditionally been outsourced to advertising agencies allowing little or no direct contact between politicians and the public) and the fact that very few candidates had an on-line presence by way of a blog, website or a profile on a social networking site. Additionally, the candidates were asked to take a position on sensitive subjects of Latvian party politics such as gay rights, non-citizen status, anti-government protests and other issues. Thereby, GudrasGalvas.lv is a website where it is possible to have direct communication with elected representatives.

Traditional media cover only party leaders and even then they usually follow the politicians' agenda. At GudrasGalvas.lv 13 political parties participated. On the website, there is also a tool where you can see whether politicians kept their promises. On their webpage you can see their motivation and answers on 12 general questions. All the political parties were represented by at least one member who answered the questions; in all more than 400 candidates used the site. After the elections the page was kept. A new functionality is that they can also blog now. Other tools are "opinion poll", "big question" and "news" from the parliament. There was a high motivation during the elections. Now it is more complicated.

Discussion & Questions:

In the UK there are similar projects. The advantage of the Latvian project is that Latvia is a small country and there is direct communication. Candidates' lists were provided (11 out of 13).

Who developed the website?: First, the founders had a global idea of creating a platform. The developers should be neutral. A company answered on their tweet. Partially because the developers are young it was a success. 10% of all voters participated.

Summary: Offering the website to other countries.

Project Presentation by Julius Narkunas (Lithuania)

Reducing the notion of "social media" to the internet communication channels, what is excluded is a wide range of communication forms, which are being kept up by those groups of citizens, who do not use internet actively. Also, the huge potential of traditional forms of communication, based on handwriting, is being ignored. As an ironic concept of bringing internet communication tools to the streets, "WEB_0" turns an anonymous public space to a temporal playground for communication with strangers. As an easy-to-use communication tool, which is synchronized with an internet platform, it brings a possibility for every "street blogger" to reach a wide audience both offline and online. But also "WEB_0" tools are able to encourage citizens to experiment, searching for new alternative tools of communication with neighbours or passers-by.

Metaphor: the city as a media.

Problem: Online and mobile communication tools are pulling out traditional urban communication.

Solution: Street Blog (Web 0). It is an interactive street element, which could be installed anywhere in the city.

Ways of use: citizenship education, local community building, neighbourhood activation

Web: Web0.wordpress.com

Project Presentation Mieke van Heesewijk (the Netherlands)

She is the founder of Network Democracy. Network Democracy promotes cooperation between the system (government and established organizations) and social pioneers by offering a platform for new developments. Pioneers can go here for networking capabilities, expertise, financial support knowledge and incentive. The system can go here for networking capabilities, expertise, in exchange for providing inputs, contracts or other forms of support aimed at developing of innovative tools for improving and renewing democracy and the democratic system. Examples of previous projects: www.watstemtmijnraad.nl and www.petities.nl. The main goal of Network Democracy is to connect traditional democratic world with the digital world. The main focus lies on open data: new applications, new discussions, new insights. MP's I-call agenda (e.g. Obama's agenda), track and trace (where the law is), events network.

Discussion & Questions:

What is her vision about open data? It should shake-up democracy, and a replacement of career politicians by more committed people.

Final discussion

Does Web 2.0 offer an innovative, interesting toolbox for citizenship education?

- No, but people can make the difference.
- Yes, if it serves to share your citizenship action, for example Facebook as a virtual beer mat.

Alternative question: What does Web 2.0 offer for citizenship education?

- Google ads for target group
- settings necessary if it occurs to our requirements
- need of offline reason for online action
- example of shared space
- Form-Follows-Function. You can use Twitter to achieve your goal

Does the changing culture of participation and activation through the net cause new requirements regarding the target groups of citizenship education?

- The government is a target group
 - open data
 - start listening
 - co-create in dialogue
 - be responsive, transparent, honest and accountable

Go to your target group! & active to offline communities & jump on popular channels & form partnerships even with commercial companies as long as it serves the idea of citizenship education

- Inactive citizenship
 - dare to simplify (average reading age is 12)
 - various levels of complexity
 - data visualization
- Companies
 - data visualization

What are the most important challenges for citizenship education?

- Interoperability of linked open data
- Accessibility of information
- to become better citizens even without the use of the web
- to develop initiatives by listening to the people → enable them for active citizenship
- to raise awareness for the duties and rights of citizenship
- to make citizenship local ↔ global

Conclusion: The citizens is us